

RECEIVED.

(615) 252-2363

2654 Fix 2) Fix 1: 02 Fax (615) 252-6363 Email hwalker@boultcummings.com

T.R.A. DOCKET ROOM

March 29, 2004

Honorable Deborah Taylor Tate, Chairman Tennessee Regulatory Authority 460 James Robertson Parkway Nashville, Tennessee 37243

Re.

Implementation of the Federal Communications Commission's Triennial

Review Order—9 Month Proceeding—Loop and Transport

Docket No 03-00527

Dear Chairman Tate

Enclosed please find the original and fourteen (14) copies of the Public Version of Errata to Rebuttal Testimony of Gary J. Ball to be filed on behalf of the Competitive Carriers of the South, Inc. ("CompSouth") in the above-captioned docket. A proprietary version is being submitted separately subject to the terms of the Protective Order entered in this docket.

Very truly yours,

BOULT, CUMMINGS, CONNERS & BERRY, PLC

By Henry Walker KG

HW/k

ERRATA TO REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF GARY J. BALL

BEFORE THE TENNESSEE REGULATORY AUTHORITY

DOCKET NO. 03-00527

Rebuttal Testimony

- p 17, lines 6 and 14, *** BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL ***
 *** END CONFIDENTIAL ***
- 2. p 19, lines 1 and 2, *** BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL ***

 *** END CONFIDENTIAL ***
- 3. p 25, line 9, insert "(or No Routes) " after "with the notation "'NR "
- p. 25, line 10 Insert the following sentences before the sentence that begins "Even for those.." "BellSouth also identified CLECs as trigger candidates based on its own collocation records, even though these carriers did not respond to discovery and BellSouth's data is unverified. I have identified these CLECs with the notation 'ND' (or No Data)."
- 5. p. 25, lines 18 and 19, *** BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL ***

 *** END CONFIDENTIAL ***
- p. 26, line 21, *** BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL ***
 END CONFIDENTIAL ***

7 p 28, line 23, *** BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL ***
*** END CONFIDENTIAL ***

p. 33, line 17, *** BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL ***

*** END CONFIDENTIAL ***

Exhibits:

1. *** BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL ***

*** END

CONFIDENTIAL ***

1 2	II.	CRITIQUE OF BELLSOUTH'S SELF-PROVISIONING TRIGGER ANALYSIS
3		A. <u>HIGH CAPACITY LOOPS</u>
4	Q.	HAVE YOU REVIEWED BELLSOUTH'S TESTIMONY
5		CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF THE SELF-
6		PROVISIONING TRIGGER TO HIGH CAPACITY LOOPS?
7	Α	Yes, I have reviewed the testimony of Shelley W Padgett regarding High-
8		Capacity Loops beginning at page 2 of her testimony.
9		
10	Q.	WHAT WERE BELLSOUTH'S CONCLUSIONS REGARDING
11		THE SELF-PROVISIONING TRIGGER ANALYSIS?
12	Α	BellSouth has asserted that 37 customer loop locations satisfy the self-
13		provisioning trigger at both the DS3 and dark fiber capacity levels The
14		specific customer locations are listed on Exhibit SWP-3 of Ms. Padgett's
15		Testimony
16		
17	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PROCESS THAT BELLSOUTH USED
18		TO IDENTIFY HIGH CAPACITY LOOP LOCATIONS FOR ITS
19		SELF-PROVISIONING TRIGGER ANALYSIS.
20	A	BellSouth developed a list of building locations for which it claims
21		competitive providers have deployed fiber optic facilities using discovery
22		responses from the competitive providers and data from GeoResults, a
23		third-party marketing firm. For each building on the list, BellSouth asserts
24		that two or more competitive providers are providing services at the

Docket No. 03-00527 Rebuttal Testimony of Gary J. Ball On behalf of CompSouth

1		building for both the dark fiber and DS3 capacity levels, and thus claims
2		that the self-provisioning trigger has been met. BellSouth lists the
3		following carriers as self-provisioning trigger providers at one or more
4		locations *** BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL ***
5		
6		
7		*** END
8		CONFIDENTIAL ***
9		
10	Q.	DID YOU REVIEW ANY OF THE DATA RESPONSES PROVIDED
11		BY THESE CLECS?
12	Α	Yes. I reviewed the proprietary responses of *** BEGIN
13		CONFIDENTIAL ***
14		
15	1	
16		*** END
17		CONFIDENTIAL ***BellSouth relied solely upon GeoResults, a third
18		party marketing firm, as the source for those CLECs
19		
20	Q.	DID BELLSOUTH APPROPRIATELY IMPLEMENT THE SELF-
21		PROVISIONING TRIGGER FOR HIGH CAPACITY LOOPS?
22	Α	No Based on my review of the information in this case, including the
23		majority of the CLEC data responses, BellSouth has overstated the

1		number of customer locations for which the self-provisioning loop trigger
2		is met. In Exhibit GJB-1, I have revised Exhibit SWP-3 of Ms. Padgett's
3		testimony based on the data contained in the CLEC discovery responses.
4		Where CLECs acknowledged in their discovery responses that they self-
5		provisioned loops at the DS3 level, I indicated so under the column with
6		the CLEC's name. If a CLEC that BellSouth listed as serving a particular
7		location did not indicate that it served that location in its discovery
8		responses, then I noted that the CLEC does not qualify as a trigger
9		candidate at that customer location. In doing so, I specified the reason that
10		the CLEC does not qualify in the column titled "Basis of Exclusion" Of
11		the discovery responses that I have reviewed, no CLEC indicated that it
12		self-provisioned dark fiber loops at any customer location
13		
14	Q.	OF THE BUILDINGS LISTED IN BELLSOUTH'S TESTIMONY,
15		HOW MANY BUILDINGS POTENTIALLY SATISFY THE SELF-
16		PROVISIONING TRIGGER BASED UPON THE CLEC DATA
17		RESPONSES?
18	A.	Of the customer locations that BellSouth claims satisfy the self-
19		provisioning trigger for DS3 loops, I have identified 4 buildings that may
20		meet the trigger. These buildings are indicated with a "1" in the column
21		titled "Trigger Candidate?" in Exhibit GJB-1. There are 5 additional
22		buildings that could potentially meet the trigger depending upon clarifying
23		the responses of *** BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL ***

1		
2		
3		*** END CONFIDENTIAL
4		***
5		
6	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN THE CODES YOU PROVIDED UNDER THE
7		BASIS OF ELIMINATION COLUMN.
8	A.	I used four different codes in the "basis of elimination" column to
9		disqualify CLECs as triggers from the buildings BellSouth listed in
10		Exhibit SWP-3. The first code is NR, which means that the building
11		BellSouth indicated as being served by a CLEC was not included in the
12		building list provided by the CLEC. The second code is OCN, which
13		indicates that the CLEC is providing OCN or 3 DS3 and above level
14		service at the location. The third code is GEO, which indicates that
15		BellSouth relied solely upon GeoResults to identify the trigger. The
16		fourth and final code is NDS3, indicating that the CLEC stated in its
17		discovery responses that it is not currently self-provisioning loops at the
18		DS3 capacity level to the given location
19		
20	Q.	PLEASE PROVIDE AN EXAMPLE OF A CLEC THAT
21		BELLSOUTH INCLUDED AS A TRIGGER EVEN THOUGH
22		THAT CARRIER DID NOT INCLUDE ANY TENNESSEE
23		BUILDINGS IN ITS DISCOVERY RESPONSE.

1	A.	In its region-wide discovery response, *** BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL
2		***
3		
4		
5		*** END CONFIDENTIAL ***
6		
7	Q.	PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR BASIS OF EXCLUDING BUILDINGS
8		BEING SERVED AT AN OC(N) OR 3 DS3 AND ABOVE LEVEL
9		OF CAPACITY?
10	A.	As I described earlier in my testimony, the FCC has already determined
11		that no impairment exists for locations that have a demand for an OC(n) or
12		3 DS3 level of capacity, and is seeking to identify locations that have
13		lower demand for only 1 or 2 DS3s A location for which a CLEC is
14		providing 3 or more DS3s does not provide evidence that another CLEC
15		can overcome the costs of deploying a loop to serve only 1 or 2 DS3s.
16		
17	Q.	HOW DID BELLSOUTH USE GEORESULTS TO SUPPORT ITS
18		TRIGGER FILINGS?
19	A.	In her testimony, Ms Padgett states that BellSouth relied upon GeoResults
20		to identify building locations for its trigger analyses if BellSouth believed
21		that the CLEC data BellSouth received was incomplete if it did not receive
22		CLEC data. In Exhibit SWP-13 to her testimony, Ms. Padgett indicates
23		the following carriers for which BellSouth relied solely upon GeoResults:

1		*** BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL ***
2		*** END
3		CONFIDENTIAL ***
4		
5	Q.	BASED UPON YOUR REVIEW OF GEORESULTS OUTPUTS IN
6		OTHER STATES, DOES GEORESULTS PROVIDE SUFFICIENT
7		INFORMATION TO DETERMINE WHETHER CLECS ARE
8		PROVIDING SERVICE CONSISTENT WITH THE SELF-
9		PROVISIONING OR WHOLESALE TIGGERS?
10	Α	No GeoResults produces a lengthy list of companies for which it
11		identifies as "Lit CLECs", including retail establishments, banks,
12		enterprise customer locations, paging companies, and long distance
13		resellers It does not appear to have the intelligence to distinguish actual
14		fiber facilities from those using another carrier's facilities.
15		
16	Q.	HAS ANOTHER ILEC ACKNOWLEDGED THAT GEORESULTS
17		FALSELY IDENTIFIES CLECS AS PRESENT IN BUILDINGS
18		WHEN THEY ACTAULLY ARE NOT?
19	Α	Yes. For example, in Illinois, SBC testified that GeoResults had identified
20		*** BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL ***
21		*** END CONFIDENTIAL *** See
22		Testimony of Rebecca L. Sparks on Behalf of SBC Illinois, Illinois
23		Commerce Commission, Docket No. 03-0596, at 17 (Feb. 4, 2004)

1		
2	Q.	DO YOU HAVE SPECIFIC DOUBTS AS TO WHETHER
3		CERTAIN CLECS LISTED BY BELLSOUTH COULD QUALIFY
4		AS TRIGGERS?
5	A.	Yes. For example, *** BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL ***
6		·
7		
8		
9		
0		
11		
12		
13		
14		*** END CONFIDENTIAL *** Clearly, if BellSouth
15		identified these companies based on GeoResults, then the methodology
16		used by GeoResults must be called into question
17		
18	Q.	HOW SHOULD THE GEORESULTS DATA BE USED IN THE
19		TRIGGER ANALYSES?
20	A.	The data could be used to develop a baseline list of buildings, which then
21		could be presented to the CLECs. The CLECs, in turn, could validate
22		whether the information contained in GeoResults is accurate and whether

1		they are providing the appropriate type and capacity level of service
2		required by the triggers.
3		
4	Q.	HOW SHOULD THE TRA PROCEED BASED UPON THE
5		EVIDENCE PROVIDED?
6	A.	I recommend that the Authority request further information from the
7		trigger CLECs for the 9 buildings that I have identified as potentially
8		meeting the triggers. Such information includes identifying whether the
9		CLECs are currently self-provisioning DS3 loops at the location, whether
10		they are doing so as part of an OC(n) or 3 DS3 level of demand, and
11		whether they have access to all customers in the building
12		
13		B. <u>DEDICATED TRANSPORT</u>
14	Q.	HAVE YOU REVIEWED BELLSOUTH'S TESTIMONY
15		CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF THE SELF-
16		PROVISIONING TRIGGER TO DEDICATED TRANSPORT
17		ROUTES?
18	A.	Yes, I have reviewed the testimony of Shelley W. Padgett beginning on
19		page 17
20		
21	Q.	WHAT WERE BELLSOUTH'S CONCLUSIONS REGARDING
22		THE SELF-PROVISIONING TRIGGER ANALYSIS FOR
23		DEDICATED TRANSPORT?

1	Α	BellSouth has asserted that 81 transport routes satisfy the self-provisioning
2		trigger for DS3 service and for dark fiber The routes are listed in
3		Attachment SWP-8 to Ms Padgett's testimony.
4		
5	Q.	WHAT WAS THE PROCESS THAT BELLSOUTH USED TO
6		IDENTIFY DEDICATED TRANSPORT ROUTES THAT IT
7		CLAIMS SATISFY THE SELF-PROVISIONING TRIGGER?
8	A.	Similar to her process for loops, BellSouth witness Padgett developed a
9		list of wire centers at which competitive providers have established
10		collocation arrangements based upon information that BellSouth gathered
11		in discovery and through examining its own collocation records.
12		BellSouth then assumed that transport routes exist between each and every
13		collocation arrangement within a given LATA for each individual carrier
14		for both the DS3 and dark fiber capacity levels
15		
16	Q.	DID BELLSOUTH PERFORM THE APPROPRIATE ANALYSIS
17		TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THE SELF-PROVISIONING
18		TRIGGERS WERE SATISFIED FOR DEDICATED TRANSPORT?
19	Α	No BellSouth's analysis relies almost exclusively upon the "connect the
20		dots" approach, in which it simply asserts that a transport route exists
21		between each and every CLEC wire center, even if the CLEC itself denies
22		or does not indicate that it provides a dedicated transport route between
23		the two wire centers I have reviewed the discovery responses that CLECs

Docket No. 03-00527 Rebuttal Testimony of Gary J. Ball On behalf of CompSouth

1		have submitted in this proceeding. I have compared the list of transport
2		routes that CLECs have identified in their discovery responses with the
3		transport routes that BellSouth has identified as being served by those
4		CLECs. As I discuss below, as a result of this review, I have compiled a
5		list of transport routes - of the routes that BellSouth claims that satisfy the
6		self-provisioning trigger - that potentially could satisfy this trigger. See
7		Exhibit GJB-2 In Exhibit GJB-2, I have identified CLECs that BellSouth
8		claims are trigger candidates despite their statements that they do not
9		provide dedicated transport with the notation "NR" (or No Routes).
		BellSouth also identified CLECs as trigger candidates based on its own
		collocation records, even though these carriers did not respond to
		discovery and BellSouth's data is unverified. I have identified these
10		CLECs with the notation "ND" (or No Data). Even for those CLECs that
11		indicate they may be capable of providing transport, BellSouth has not
12		provided any evidence that those CLECs are self-provisioning at the DS3
13		capacity level These CLECs are indicated with a "?" in Exhibit GJB-2.
14		
15	Q.	WERE YOU ABLE TO REVIEW ANY OF THE CLEC DATA
16		RESPONSES FOR TRANSPORT?
17	A.	Yes. I reviewed the responses of *** BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL ***
18		
19		
20	I	

Deleted:

ı		
2		
3		
4		
5		*** END
6		CONFIDENTIAL *** as triggers on numerous routes based solely upon
7		BellSouth's own collocation records.
8		
9	Q.	DID BELLSOUTH IDENTIFY CARRIERS AS SELF-
10		PROVISIONING DEDICATED TRANSPORT EVEN THOUGH
11		THE CARRIER DENIED SELF-PROVISIONING DEDICATED
12		TRANSPORT ALONG ANY ROUTE?
13	Α	Yes. *** BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL ***
14		*** END CONFIDENTIAL *** as trigger candidates
15		despite the fact that each of these carriers denied providing any transport
16		between BellSouth wire centers whatsoever.
17		
18	Q.	ARE THERE TRANSPORT ROUTES THAT COULD QUALIFY
19		FOR THE SELF-PROVISIONING TRIGGER IF ALL OF THE
20		QUESTION MARKS BECAME REALITY?
21	Α	Yes There are 28 routes in Memphis that could conceivably meet the
22		self-provisioning trigger See Exhibit GJB-2 These routes would satisfy
23		the self-provisioning trigger only if *** BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL ***

1		*** END CONFIDENTIAL
2		*** each self-provisioning dedicated transport at the DS3 capacity level
3		on these routes. Each of these CLECs would need to provide further
4		information to make this determination.
5		
6	Q.	HOW DID YOU ARRIVE AT THE DETERMINATION THAT 28
7		DEDICATED TRANSPORT ROUTES MIGHT SATISFY THE
8		FCC'S SELF-PROVISIONING TRIGGER?
9	A.	I reviewed the CLEC discovery responses submitted in this proceeding,
10		and I compared those discovery responses with the dedicated transport
11		routes that BellSouth claims satisfy the self-provisioning trigger. As an
12		initial matter, as I stated above, I determined whether the carrier stated that
13		it provided dedicated transport. If the carrier denied providing dedicated
14		transport (such as *** BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL ***
15		*** END CONFIDENTIAL ***), then I removed those carriers
16		from BellSouth's route list. I then compared the list of routes along which
17		the carriers themselves stated that they provisioned dedicated transport
18		(for example, for *** BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL ***
19		END CONFIDENTIAL ***) with the list of routes that BellSouth
20		claimed that carrier served. I then compared the capacity level at which
21		BellSouth claimed the carrier self-provisioned dedicated transport along
22		the route with the responses that the carriers themselves provided. After
23		performing each of these steps, I identified the routes where there are three

1		or more carriers that potentially self-provide dedicated transport along the
2		route at the capacity level listed therein.
3	Q.	IS IT APPROPRIATE FOR BELLSOUTH TO IDENTIFY A
4		ROUTE BASED SOLELY UPON ITS COLLOCATION RECORDS?
5	Α	No BellSouth does not have enough information to make a determination
6		that a transport route satisfies the self-provisioning trigger based solely on
7		its collocation records For example, collocation records do not indicate
8		whether the carrier actually is providing a transport service between those
9		collocations. Nor does BellSouth have information regarding the capacity
10		level at which the carrier provides service, if any, or whether the service is
11		self-provisioned or wholesale
12		
13	Q.	SHOULD BELLSOUTH HAVE INCLUDED ALL OF THESE
14		CLECS AS TRIGGERS BASED UPON YOUR REVIEW OF THEIR
15		DATA RESPONSES.
16	Α	No It is inappropriate to include any of the CLECs that do not
17		acknowledge self-provisioning transport between the ILEC wire centers
18		As I explained earlier in my testimony, "connecting the dots" between
19		CLEC collocation arrangements is not an appropriate means of identifying
20		self-provisioned transport routes.
21		
22	Q.	HOW SHOULD THE TRA PROCEED WITH THE EVIDENCE
23		PROVIDED?

1	Α	The TRA should request further information from *** BEGIN
2		CONFIDENTIAL , *** END
3		CONFIDENTIAL *** to determine whether these CLECs are actually
4		self-provisioning dedicated transport between each wire center indicated
5		on Exhibit GJB-2 at the DS3 or dark fiber capacity level consistent with
6		the requirements of the TRO
7		
8 9	III.	CRITIQUE OF BELLSOUTH FLORIDA WHOLESALE TRIGGER ANALYSES
10		A. <u>HIGH CAPACITY LOOPS</u>
11	Q.	HAVE YOU REVIEWED BELLSOUTH'S TESTIMONY
12		CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF THE WHOLESALE
13		TRIGGER TO HIGH CAPACITY LOOPS?
14	Α	Yes, I have reviewed the testimony of Shelley W. Padgett beginning at
15		page 12
16		
17	Q.	WHAT WERE BELLSOUTH'S CONCLUSIONS REGARDING
18		THE WHOLESALE TRIGGER ANALYSIS?
19	A.	BellSouth has asserted that the same buildings that it claimed for the self-
20		provisioning trigger also satisfy the wholesale facilities trigger, with the
21		exception of several buildings that it claims do not satisfy the wholesale
22		trigger at the DS1 capacity level (Bellsouth claimed only 33 locations for
23		DS1, compared to 37 for DS3) The customer specific locations are listed
24		in Attachment SWP-3 to Ms Padgett's testimony.

1		
2	Q.	WHAT WAS THE PROCESS BELLSOUTH USED TO IDENTIFY
3	•	THE BUILDINGS THAT IT CLAIMS SATISFY THE
4		WHOLESALE TRIGGER?
5	A.	On page 13 of Ms Padgett's testimony, Ms. Padgett lists the broad range
6		of sources that she used to identify carriers as wholesalers, including
7		CLEC discovery responses, BellSouth's "experience" in losing wholesale
8		contracts, carriers' advertisements, carriers' public statements, and analyst
9		and industry reports. Ms Padgett then continues with a creative assertion
10		that the carrier does not even have to be currently selling wholesale
11		service to qualify for the wholesale trigger Instead, according to Ms.
12		Padgett, the carrier simply needs to express some sort of "willingness" to
13		provide wholesale services. Under BellSouth's view, everyone is a
14		wholesaler, whether they realize it or not.
15		
16	Q.	DOES THE TRO ALLOW FOR CLECS TO BE DECLARED
17		WHOLESALERS AGAINST THEIR WILL?
18	A.	No The intent of the TRO and the wholesale triggers is to identify
19		locations where CLECs have made an affirmative business decision to
20		provide wholesale services, and have implemented the appropriate
21		network configurations and back office support systems to provide a
22		comparable service to that provided by the UNE that is being replaced. In
23		paragraph 337 of the TRO, the FCC provides the numerous requirements

	that a CLEC must meet to be a wholesaler for the purposes of the trigger:
	"where the relevant state commission determines that two or more
	unaffiliated alternative providersoffer an equivalent wholesale loop
	product at a comparable level of capacity, quality, and reliability, have
	access to the entire multiunit customer premises, and offer the specific
	type of high-capacity loop over their own facilities on a widely available
	wholesale basis to other carriers desiring to service customers at that
	location, then incumbent LEC loops at the same loop capacity level
	serving that particular building will no longer be unbundled." Clearly, the
	FCC is intending to identify CLECs who have chosen to provide
	wholesale service to the given locations, and have implemented the
	necessary network and back-office systems to provide such services.
Q.	DID THE FCC REQUIRE EVIDENCE OF BACK OFFICE
	SUPPORT SYSTEMS TO QUALIFY A CLEC AS A
	WHOLESALER?
Α.	Yes. In making its determination that there is "scant evidence of
	wholesale alternatives for serving customers at the DS1 level" in
	paragraph 325, the FCC concluded that, "[t]he record indicates that even
	competitive carriers that have deployed their own loop facilities do not
	have the back office support systems in place that are necessary to offer
	any excess capacity on a wholesale basis to other competitive LECs." (see
	footnote 958).

1		
2	Q.	WHY IS IT IMPORTANT THAT THE WHOLESALE TRIGGER
3		BE TREATED SEPARATELY FROM THE SELF-PROVISIONING
4		TRIGGER AND THAT CARE BE TAKEN TO AVOID
5		INCORRECTLY LABELING A CARRIER AS A WHOLESALER?
6	A.	Unlike the self-provisioning trigger, the wholesale trigger includes access
7		to loops at the DS1 capacity level, meaning that CLECs potentially could
8		be denied access to those loops if the wholesale trigger were met despite
9		the FCC's finding that it is practically impossible for a CLEC to
0		economically provision a standalone DS1 loop. DS1 loops are the primary
11		means of provisioning service to medium-size enterprise customers for
12		CLECs, and denial of DS1-loops would be a severe impediment to the
13		CLEC's ability to provide competitive services.
14		
15	Q.	HAVE YOU BEEN ABLE TO NARROW THE NUMBER OF
16		BUILDINGS THAT POTENTIALLY COULD MEET THE
17		WHOLESALE TRIGGER?
18	Α	Yes I have reviewed the CLECs' discovery responses and compared
19		those responses against the list of customer locations that BellSouth claims
20		satisfy the wholesale trigger See Exhibit GJB-3. Based on this review,
21		there are two buildings that potentially satisfy the wholesale trigger for
22		DS3 loops and one building that may meet the wholesale trigger for DS1
23		loops

Deleted	: ¶	

1 Q.	WHAT STEPS DID YOU TAKE TO CREATE THE LIST OF
2	BUILDINGS THAT POTENTIALLY SATISFY THE WHOLESALE
3	TRIGGER?
4 A	As I stated above, I reviewed the discovery responses submitted in this
5	proceeding As a threshold matter, I determined whether the carrier stated
6	that it provided wholesale loops. If a carrier denied providing wholesale
7	loops, then I removed that carrier from BellSouth's list of customer
8	locations I then determined whether the carrier listed in its discovery
9	responses the building that BellSouth claimed it served. I also reviewed
10	the capacity levels at which the carrier stated that it provided wholesale
11	service. At the end of these inquiries, there were four buildings that had
12	two or more CLECs that potentially provided wholesale service at the DS3
13	capacity level and one building that had two or more CLECs that
14	potentially provided wholesale service at the DS1 level. I did not have
15	access to the customer location lists (if they have been filed in this
16	proceeding) of *** BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL ***
17	*** END CONFIDENTIAL ***. If it
18	turns out that these carriers are offering wholesale loops at the relevant
19	capacity levels to the buildings BellSouth indicated, these numbers could
20	be slightly higher.
21	

1	Q.	WHAT ADDITIONAL STEPS NEED TO BE TAKEN TO ENSURE
2		THAT THE BUILDINGS IDENTIFIED ACTUALLY WOULD
3		MEET THE WHOLESALE TRIGGER?
4	Α	Similar to the self-provisioning trigger, the CLEC must be able to serve all
5		customers in the building, and must be willingly offering wholesale loops
6		at the building at the relevant capacity level to other CLECs.
7		Additionally, it must be validated that the CLEC's wholesale offering is
8		widely available to competitors on a nondiscriminatory basis, and that the
9		CLEC has the necessary back office systems to support the provision of
10		wholesale loops service
11		
12	Q.	DID BELLSOUTH PROPERLY VERIFY THE AVAILABILITY OF
13		DS1 LOOP SERVICES ON A WHOLESALE BASIS FOR THE
14		BUILDINGS IT LISTED?
15	Α	No According to BellSouth witness Padgett, BellSouth made an
16		assumption that any existing fiber facility can provide DS1 level service,
17		and that the appropriate level of customer demand exists to support
18		standalone DS1 loops. This assumption is incorrect DS1-level service
19		only can be provided when a fiber facility has been equipped with the
20		appropriate electronics, including an optical multiplexer with the
21		capability of provisioning DS1 channels The FCC was very clear in its
22		requirement that wholesale service must be available at the specific
23		capacity level in order for the trigger to be satisfied.

1		
2	Q.	DID THE FCC ANTICIPATE THAT A VERY SMALL NUMBER
3		OF BUILDINGS WOULD SATISFY THE WHOLESALE
4		TRIGGERS?
5	Α.	Yes In paragraph 338 of the TRO, the FCC stated, "[w]e recognize that,
6		while the record indicates that there are presently a limited number of
7		alternative wholesale loop providers serving multiunit premises, we
8		anticipate that a competitive market will continue to develop." (emphasis
9		added)
10		
11		B. <u>DEDICATED TRANSPORT</u>
12	Q.	HAVE YOU REVIEWED BELLSOUTH'S TESTIMONY
13		CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF THE WHOLESALE
14		TRIGGER TO DEDICATED TRANSPORT ROUTES?
15	Α	Yes, I have reviewed the testimony of Shelley W. Padgett beginning on
16		page 29 of her testimony.
17		
18	Q.	WHAT WERE BELLSOUTH'S CONCLUSIONS REGARDING
19		THE WHOLESALE TRIGGER ANALYSIS?
20	Α	BellSouth has asserted that the same number (81) routes it asserted meet
21		the self-provisioning trigger also meet the wholesale triggers for DS3 and
22		DS1, and that 75 routes meet the wholesale trigger for dark fiber. The

1		transport routes with the trigger CLECs are listed on Attachment SWP-8
2		to Ms. Padgett's testimony
3		
4	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PROCESS BELLSOUTH USED TO
5		IDENTIFY DEDICATED TRANSPORT ROUTES THAT IT
6		CONTENDS SATISFY THE WHOLESALE PROVISIONING
7		TRIGGER.
8	Α	BellSouth used the same "connect the dots" approach to collecting data
9		that I described above in my critique of the self-provisioning trigger, and
10		used the same broad-brush approach to identify wholesale service
11		providers as it used for loops, essentially assuming without supporting
12		evidence that every competitive transport provider is providing wholesale
13		on each and every route
14		
15	Q.	DOES BELLSOUTH HAVE AN INCENTIVE TO BE OVERLY
16		BROAD IN ITS IDENTIFICATION OF WHOLESALE
17		TRANSPORT ROUTES?
18	A.	Yes. First, similar to the wholesale trigger for loops, routes that meet the
19		wholesale trigger also are eligible to have DS1-level transport delisted,
20		which is not possible under the self-provisioning trigger. Additionally,
21		since the wholesale trigger for dedicated transport only requires evidence
22		of two competing providers, as opposed to the three for the self-
23		provisioning trigger, BellSouth can increase the total number of routes to

Docket No. 03-00527 Rebuttal Testimony of Gary J. Ball On behalf of CompSouth

1		be delisted if it can certify that the providers are wholesalers instead of
2		self-provisioners
3		
4	Q.	DOES BELLSOUTH'S ANALYSIS OF THE WHOLESALE
5		TRIGGERS FOR TRANSPORT SATISFY THE FCC
6		REQUIREMENTS?
7	Α	No. BellSouth's analysis of the wholesale trigger for transport
8		incorporates all of the flaws of the self-provisioning analysis mentioned
9		above. Additionally, similar to the wholesale loop triggers, BellSouth
10		declared *** BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL *** *** END
11		CONFIDENTIAL *** as wholesalers even though they specifically
12		denied providing wholesale services.
13		
14	Q.	HOW MANY ROUTES MAY BE ELIGIBLE FOR THE
15		WHOLESALE TRIGGER?
16	Α	Based on my review of the CLEC data responses, the same 28 routes I
17		identified as potentially satisfying the self-provisioning trigger potentially
18		also qualify for the wholesale trigger
19		
20	Q.	WHAT FURTHER INFORMATION WOULD NEED TO BE
21		GATHERED TO MAKE A DETERMINATION AS TO WHETHER
22		ANY OF THESE 28 ROUTES ACTUALLY MEET THE
23		WHOLESALE TRIGGER?

1	A.	First, an evaluation must be made as to whether the CLECs are currently
2		equipped and operationally ready to provide dedicated transport on the
3		route at the relevant capacity level. Second, evidence must be gathered as
4		to whether the CLEC 1s willing and capable of immediately providing
5		wholesale service to another CLEC, including whether the CLEC has
6		implemented all of the necessary back office systems necessary to provide
7		such a service.
8		
9 10	IV.	POTENTIAL DEPLOYMENT ANALYSIS FOR HIGH-CAPACITY LOOPS AND DEDICATED TRANSPORT
11	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE WHAT IS MEANT BY POTENTIAL
12		DEPLOYMENT.
13	Α	The potential deployment analysis essentially provides that BellSouth may
14		attempt to demonstrate that no impairment exists for loop locations or
15		transport routes even though the self-provisioning tngger has not been
16		satisfied.
17		
18	Q.	ARE DS1-CAPACITY LEVEL LOOPS AND TRANSPORT
19		ELIGIBLE FOR A POTENTIAL DEPLOYMENT CLAIM?
20	A.	No. The FCC defined potential deployment as a theoretical substitute for
21		the self-provisioning trigger. As such, only those capacity levels eligible
22		for the self-provisioning trigger (DS3 and dark fiber) are eligible for
23		potential deployment claims

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 29, 2004, a copy of the foregoing document was serviced on the parties of record, via US mail:

Martha M. Ross-Bain, Esq AT&T Communications of the South Central States, LLC 1200 Peachtree Street, Suite 8062 Atlanta, GA 30309

Charles B. Welch, Esq. Farris, Mathews, et. al. 618 Church St, #300 Nashville, TN 37219

Timothy Phillips, Esq.
Office of Tennessee Attorney General
P O Box 20207
Nashville, TN 37202

H. LaDon Baltimore, Esq. Farrar & Bates 211 Seventh Ave., N. #320 Nashville, TN 37219-1823

James Wright, Esq.
United Telephone – Southeast
14111 Capital Blvd.
Wake Forest, NC 27587

Guy Hicks, Esq. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. 333 Commerce St, Suite 2101 Nashville, TN 37201 Ms. Carol Kuhnow Qwest Communications, Inc. 4250 N Fairfax Dr. Arlington, VA 22203

Jon E. Hastings Boult Cummings Conners Berry, PLC P. O. Box 198062 Nashville, TN 37219-8062

Dale Grimes
Bass, Berry & Sims
315 Deaderick St., #2700
Nashville, TN 37238-3001

Mark W. Smith, Esq. Strang, Fletcher, et. al. One Union Square, #400 Chattanooga, TN 37402

Nanette S. Edwards, Esq. ITC^DeltaCom 4092 South Memorial Parkway Huntsville, AL 35802

Kennard B. Woods, Esq. WorldCom, Inc. Six Concourse Parkway, Suite 600 Atlanta, Georgia 30328

Henry Wallle

905090 v1 100071-000 3/29/2004